

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
Region VIII
Denver Federal Center, Building 710
P.O. Box 25267
Denver, CO. 80225-0267



FEMA
RECEIVED

DEC 30 2004

DISASTER & EMERGENCY SERVICES
STATE OF MONTANA

R8 - FIMD

December 23, 2004

Daniel McGowan, Administrator
Division of Disaster and Emergency Services
1900 Williams Street
Helena, MT 59604-4789

Reference: PLAN APPROVAL – POWELL COUNTY
MULTI-HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN

Dear Mr. McGowan:

We are pleased to announce the Powell County multi-hazard mitigation plan is approved. We wish to thank all jurisdictions that participated in the process. Powell County is now eligible for Pre-Disaster Mitigation project funds appropriated beginning in fiscal year 2004. This plan will be filed in the NEMIS database until the mandatory update is required in five years.

We trust this planning process has raised the county's risk awareness and identified future mitigation projects that can be quickly implemented as funding becomes available.

Congratulations to you and your staff for assisting local communities, and making pre-disaster mitigation planning work in your state.

Sincerely,

for John Hamrad
David I. Maurstad
Regional Director

Enclosure

cc: Larry Akers, SHMO

**LOCAL HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN REVIEW
FEMA REGION VIII**

POWELL COUNTY, MONTANA

**Instructions for using the attached Crosswalk Reference Document
for Review and Submission of Local Mitigation Plans
to the State Hazard Mitigation Officer and FEMA Regional Office**

Attached is a crosswalk reference document, which is based on the Final Draft Report ***State and Local Plan Interim Criteria Under the Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000***, published by FEMA HQ and dated July 11, 2002. This document was based on the *Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000* (P.L. 106-390), enacted October 30, 2000 and *44 CFR Parts 201 and 206 Interim Final Rule*, published February 26, 2002.

The purpose of the crosswalk is to provide a tool to local jurisdictions in developing and submitting Mitigation Plans under Section 322 of the Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000. The crosswalk can be used to assist local or multi-jurisdiction entities in the process of developing and reviewing Local or Multi-jurisdictional plan(s). Each Local or Multi-jurisdictional plan should be reviewed by the pertinent local jurisdictional entity prior to submitting the plan to the respective State. In addition as stated in the Interim Final Rule §201.6(d)(1) "Plans must be submitted to the State Hazard Mitigation Officer for initial review and coordination. The State will then send the plan to the appropriate FEMA Regional Office for formal review and approval." The local jurisdiction must fill out column 3 prior to submitting the plan for formal review and approval.

Tribes may submit hazard mitigation plans through their respective states or they can directly submit their plans to FEMA Region VIII. This means they can write a Local or Multi-jurisdictional Plan as a sub-grantee or they may write a Standard or Enhanced State Plan as a Grantee. When tribes are considering how they want to develop and submit their plans, they need to consider whether or not they want to be Grantees directly from FEMA or Sub-grantees through their respective states. The deciding factor would be how they want to apply for and receive Pre-disaster Mitigation Grant projects, Hazard Mitigation Grant Program projects, or Flood Mitigation Assistance projects. Interested tribes can determine this by talking with their State Hazard Mitigation Officer or their respective FEMA Regional Federal Insurance and Mitigation Administration (FIMA) Division. In any case, each tribe should review their own plans before submitting them to their state or FEMA Regional office.

Following are explanations of each column.

- Column 1 indicates on what page or pages in the *State and Local Plan Interim Criteria* document more detailed information can be found regarding the requirements.
- Column 2 references and directly quotes the *44 CFR Parts 201 and 206 Interim Final Rule*.
- Column 3 is for the tribe and/or local jurisdiction to indicate the Section or Annex and the page number(s) in their plan where the requirement is addressed.
- Column 4 provides space for State/FEMA comments and for scoring of the plan.

LOCAL HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN REVIEW - POWELL COUNTY, MONTANA
REGION VIII DECEMBER 23, 2004 - PAGE 1

Local Mitigation Plan Review and Approval Status

Local Requirement		
Local Plan Submitted to the State by:	Title:	Date:
Ron Hanson	Powell County Planner	August 13, 2004

State Requirement		
State Reviewer:	Title:	Date:
Larry Akers	SHMO	October 15, 2004

FEMA Requirement		
FEMA Reviewer:	Title:	Date:
Wade Nofziger	Hazard Mitigation Specialist	December 6, 2004
Marty Kientz	Hazard Mitigation Specialist	October 25, 2004
K C Collins	Planner	November 30, 2004
Date Received in FEMA Region VIII	October 20, 2004	
Plan Not Approved		
Plan Approved	XXX	
Date Approved	December 17, 2004	

**LOCAL HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN REVIEW – POWELL COUNTY, MONTANA
REGION VIII DECEMBER 23, 2004 – PAGE 2**

Point of Contact: Ron Hanson	Local Plan Reviewed by: Larry Akers	
Title: Powell County Planner	Title: SHMO	
Agency: Powell County, Montana	NFIP Status (Single Jurisdiction)	
Phone Number: 406-846-3680	Participating <input type="checkbox"/>	Non-Participating <input type="checkbox"/>

Multi-jurisdiction: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO (If yes, list each jurisdiction below:)	N/A*	NFIP Status (for mapped communities)	
1. Powell County (mapped 9/30/94 – NFIP Good Standing)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Participating <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Non-Participating <input type="checkbox"/>
2. City of Deer Lodge (mapped 4/15/81 – NFIP Good Standing)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Participating <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Non-Participating <input type="checkbox"/>
3.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Participating <input type="checkbox"/>	Non-Participating <input type="checkbox"/>
4.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Participating <input type="checkbox"/>	Non-Participating <input type="checkbox"/>
5.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Participating <input type="checkbox"/>	Non-Participating <input type="checkbox"/>
6.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Participating <input type="checkbox"/>	Non-Participating <input type="checkbox"/>
7.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Participating <input type="checkbox"/>	Non-Participating <input type="checkbox"/>
8.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Participating <input type="checkbox"/>	Non-Participating <input type="checkbox"/>
9.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Participating <input type="checkbox"/>	Non-Participating <input type="checkbox"/>
[ATTACH PAGE (S) WITH ADDITIONAL JURISDICTIONS]			

Local Plan POC: Please complete the information requested on this profile form. The form will be submitted with your plan to the State. Using the attached crosswalk, compare your local plan content with the criteria outlined. Please note under the column heading "Location in the Plan" the page(s) where your plan addresses/meets the criteria. Thank you.
--

* Not applicable for communities not mapped and/or who do not have an identified flood risk.

**LOCAL HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN REVIEW – POWELL COUNTY, MONTANA
REGION VIII DECEMBER 23, 2004 – PAGE 3**

LOCAL MITIGATION PLAN SUMMARY WORKSHEET

The plan cannot be reviewed if the prerequisite is not met for a single jurisdictional plan, or prerequisites are not met for a multi-jurisdictional plan.

All mandatory criteria, except those highlighted in gray, must receive a score of “Satisfactory” or “Outstanding” for the plan to receive FEMA approval. A less than “Satisfactory” score on subsections highlighted in gray will not preclude the plan from passing. Reviewer’s comments must be provided for requirements receiving a “Needs Improvement” score.

SCORING SYSTEM

Please check one of the following for each requirement.

U – Unsatisfactory: The plan does not address the criteria.

N – Needs Improvement: The plan addresses the criteria, but needs significant improvement. Reviewer’s comments must be provided.

S – Satisfactory: The plan meets the minimum criteria. Reviewer’s comments are encouraged, but not required.

O – Outstanding: The plan exceeds the minimum criteria. Reviewer’s comments are encouraged, but not required.

Prerequisite (s) (Check Applicable Box)

Adoption by the Local Governing Body:

§201.6(c)(5) OR

Multi-jurisdictional Plan Adoption: §201.6(c)(5)
AND

Multi-jurisdictional Participation: §201.6(a)(3)

NOT MET MET

	N/A
	S
	S

Planning Process

Documentation of the Planning Process:

§201.6(c)(1)

U N S O

		S	
--	--	---	--

Risk Assessment

Identifying Hazards: §201.6(c)(2)(i)

Profiling Hazard Events: §201.6(c)(2)(i)

Assessing Vulnerability: Overview: §201.6(c)(2)(ii)

Assessing Vulnerability: Identifying Assets:
§201.6(c)(2)(ii)(A)

Assessing Vulnerability: Estimating Potential
Losses: §201.6(c)(2)(ii)(B)

Assessing Vulnerability: Analyzing Development
Trends: §201.6(c)(2)(ii)(C)

Multi-jurisdictional Risk Assessment:

§201.6(c)(2)(iii)

U N S O

		S	
		S	
		S	
	N		
	N		
		S	
		S	

Mitigation Strategy

Local Hazard Mitigation Goals: §201.6(c)(3)(i)

Identification and Analysis of Mitigation Measures:

§201.6(c)(3)(ii)

Implementation of Mitigation Measures:

§201.6(c)(3)(iii)

Multi-jurisdictional Mitigation Strategy:

§201.6(c)(3)(iv)

U N S O

		S	
		S	
		S	
		S	

Plan Maintenance Procedures

Monitoring, Evaluating, and Updating the Plan:

§201.6(c)(4)(i)

Implementation Through Existing Programs:

§201.6(c)(4)(ii)

Continued Public Involvement: §201.6(c)(4)(iii)

U N S O

		S	
		S	
		S	

Additional State Requirements*

Insert State Requirement

Insert State Requirement

Insert State Requirement

U N S O

LOCAL MITIGATION PLAN APPROVAL STATUS

PLAN NOT APPROVED

PLAN APPROVED

XXX

*States that have additional requirements can add them in the appropriate sections of the *Plan Review Criteria* or create a new section. States need then modify this worksheet to record the score for those requirements.

See Reviewer’s Comments

**LOCAL HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN REVIEW – POWELL COUNTY, MONTANA
REGION VIII DECEMBER 23, 2004 – PAGE 4**

PLAN REVIEW CRITERIA REFERENCE (SECTION PAGE #)	REQUIREMENT AS TAKEN FROM THE INTERIM FINAL RULE PART 201	LOCATION IN THE PLAN (INDICATE SECTION OR ANNEX AND PAGE #)	SCORE / STATE / FEMA REVIEWER COMMENTS <u>SCORING SYSTEM</u> MET/NOT MET (FOR PREREQUISITE (S) ONLY) U--UNSATISFACTORY N--NEEDS IMPROVEMENT S--SATISFACTORY O--OUTSTANDING
PREREQUISITE (S) (3-1)			<i>NOTE: The prerequisite, or prerequisites in the case of multi-jurisdictional plans, must be met before the plan can be approved.</i>
Adoption by the Local Governing Body (3-2)	Requirement §201.6(c)(5): [The local hazard mitigation plan shall include] documentation that the plan has been formally adopted by the governing body of the jurisdiction requesting approval of the plan (e.g., City Council, County Commissioner, Tribal Council)...		N/A
OR			
Multi-Jurisdictional Plan Adoption (3-3)	Requirement §201.6(c)(5): For multi-jurisdictional plans, each jurisdiction requesting approval of the plan must document that it has been formally adopted.	Appendix A	S Resolutions by all jurisdictions were provided.
AND			
Multi-Jurisdictional Planning Participation (3-4)	Requirement §201.6(a)(3): Multi-jurisdictional plans (e.g., watershed plans) may be accepted, as appropriate, as long as each jurisdiction has participated in the process... Statewide plans will not be	Page II-1	S It is clear that a substantial public involvement process was undertaken, and it is documented that a total of 23 people representing local governments, businesses, and interested citizens were involved in the process.

LOCAL HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN REVIEW – POWELL COUNTY, MONTANA
REGION VIII DECEMBER 23, 2004 – PAGE 5

PLAN REVIEW CRITERIA REFERENCE (SECTION PAGE #)	REQUIREMENT AS TAKEN FROM THE INTERIM FINAL RULE PART 201	LOCATION IN THE PLAN (INDICATE SECTION OR ANNEX AND PAGE #)	SCORE / STATE / FEMA REVIEWER COMMENTS <u>SCORING SYSTEM</u> MET/NOT MET (FOR PREREQUISITE (S) ONLY) U--UNSATISFACTORY N--NEEDS IMPROVEMENT S--SATISFACTORY O--OUTSTANDING	
	accepted as multi-jurisdictional plans.			
PLANNING PROCESS (3-5)				
Documentation of the Planning Process (3-6)	Requirement §201.6(c)(1): [The plan must document] the planning process used to develop the plan, including how it was prepared, who was involved in the process, and how the public was involved.	Pages II-1 and II-2	S	The planning process was documented and the steps that were taken to develop the plan were provided. A good job was done providing information for the meeting held regarding Cottonwood Creek – Figure 2-1. The plan did a good job of including a copy of a newspaper article on PDM planning dated 6/30/04 – Figure 2-2.
RISK ASSESSMENT (3-9)				
Identifying Hazards (3-10)	Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(i): [The risk assessment shall include a] description of the type....of all natural hazards that can affect the jurisdiction...	Pages III-1, III-8	S	The plan lists natural hazards that impact the county. It goes as far as to list hazards separately for Powell County and Deer Lodge and narrows down the number based on potential impacts. The plan does a good job of indicating that other hazards are viewed as manageable emergencies that can be dealt with through existing LEPC plans. We suggest that for the next plan revision, the county more clearly define the process used to identify the hazards.
Profiling Hazard Events	Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(i):	Appendix D; III-8 to III-11; Appendix B	S	SHELDUS hazard data is provided in Appendix D as a list of previous events. A summary of the

LOCAL HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN REVIEW - POWELL COUNTY, MONTANA
REGION VIII DECEMBER 23, 2004 - PAGE 6

PLAN REVIEW CRITERIA REFERENCE (SECTION PAGE #)	REQUIREMENT AS TAKEN FROM THE INTERIM FINAL RULE PART 201	LOCATION IN THE PLAN (INDICATE SECTION OR ANNEX AND PAGE #)	SCORE / STATE / FEMA REVIEWER COMMENTS <u>SCORING SYSTEM</u> MET/NOT MET (FOR PREREQUISITE (S) ONLY) U--UNSATISFACTORY S--SATISFACTORY N--NEEDS IMPROVEMENT O--OUTSTANDING
Events (3-14)	[The risk assessment shall include a] description of the...location and extent of all natural hazards that can affect the jurisdiction. The plan shall include information on previous occurrences of hazard events and on the probability of future hazard events.		<p>findings of this data would enhance this plan. The available data indicated that winter weather caused the greatest property damage with severe storms second, flooding and wind thereafter. The location and extent of natural hazards that can affect the county is described in the Assessing Vulnerability Section C of the plan. The probability of hazards is outlined in Appendix B along with the frequency of occurrence in the past 5, 10 and 20 years. The plan would be enhanced if the probabilities were listed in rank order. The plan did a great job of investigating critical scour bridges, dams, and toxic release sites in the plan.</p> <p>Other data sources that are available for reference that would enhance the plan are:</p> <p>http://www.fema.gov/ for a discussion on Principal Flood Problems for the County.</p> <p>HAZUS data for 2002 indicates that seven dams in the county are high hazard and that they all have Emergency Action Plans as required by the National Dam Safety Act. The National Inventory of Dams at http://crunch.tec.army.mil/nid/webpages/nid.cfm provides more detailed information.</p>

LOCAL HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN REVIEW - POWELL COUNTY, MONTANA
REGION VIII DECEMBER 23, 2004 - PAGE 7

PLAN REVIEW CRITERIA REFERENCE (SECTION PAGE #)	REQUIREMENT AS TAKEN FROM THE INTERIM FINAL RULE PART 201	LOCATION IN THE PLAN (INDICATE SECTION OR ANNEX AND PAGE #)	SCORE / STATE / FEMA REVIEWER COMMENTS SCORING SYSTEM MET/NOT MET (FOR PREREQUISITE (S) ONLY) U--UNSATISFACTORY S--SATISFACTORY N--NEEDS IMPROVEMENT O--OUTSTANDING	
Assessing Vulnerability: Overview (Currently found under Identifying Assets section, p.3-18—to be corrected in next version of the Plan Criteria)	Requirement 201.6(c)(2)(ii): [The risk assessment shall include a] description of the jurisdiction's vulnerability to the hazards described in paragraph (c)(2)(i) of this section. This description shall include an overall summary of each hazard and its impact on the community.	III-8 to III-11	S Each hazard is assessed according to jurisdictional vulnerability and provides a summary of each hazard and its impact on the community.	
Assessing Vulnerability: Identifying Assets (3-18)	Requirement 201.6(c)(2)(ii)(A): The plan should describe vulnerability in terms of: The types and numbers of existing and future buildings, infrastructure, and critical facilities located in the identified hazard areas...	III-8 to III-14; Appendix F	N A list of vulnerable buildings and structures is provided for floods but not for all hazards analyzed in the plan. In order to receive a satisfactory rating in this section, buildings and infrastructure located in hazard prone areas, by hazard type, need to be identified. Note: A less than "Satisfactory" score on this requirement will not preclude the plan from passing	

LOCAL HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN REVIEW - POWELL COUNTY, MONTANA
REGION VIII DECEMBER 23, 2004 - PAGE 8

PLAN REVIEW CRITERIA REFERENCE (SECTION PAGE #)	REQUIREMENT AS TAKEN FROM THE INTERIM FINAL RULE PART 201	LOCATION IN THE PLAN (INDICATE SECTION OR ANNEX AND PAGE #)	SCORE / STATE / FEMA REVIEWER COMMENTS SCORING SYSTEM MET/NOT MET (FOR PREREQUISITE (S) ONLY) U--UNSATISFACTORY S--SATISFACTORY N--NEEDS IMPROVEMENT O--OUTSTANDING	
Assessing Vulnerability: Estimating Potential Losses (3-22)	Requirement 201.6(c)(2)(ii)(B): [The plan should describe vulnerability in terms of an] estimate of the potential dollar losses to vulnerable structures identified in paragraph (c)(2)(i)(A) of this section and a description of the methodology used to prepare the estimate...	Appendix F and Appendix G; III-12 to III-14	N A general list of critical facilities is provided in Appendix F. A listing of flood zone buildings with market values is provided in Appendix G. The method used to estimate potential flood losses was based on GIS data of structures in the 100-year and 500-year floodplains, and the CIP plan for bridges was referenced in some. In order to receive a satisfactory rating for this section, potential dollar losses for each hazard type needs to be provided. FEMA 386-2 could be used to estimate the dollar value of the facilities exposed to the flood hazard, and the HAZUS-MH provides estimates of the replacement value of the building stock and infrastructure in Powell County. These overall estimates could be used to develop dollar exposure to County-wide hazards. <i>Note: A less than "Satisfactory" score on this requirement will not preclude the plan from passing.</i>	
Assessing Vulnerability: Analyzing Development Trends (3-24)	Requirement 201.6(c)(2)(ii)(C): [The plan should describe vulnerability in terms of] providing a general description of land uses and development trends within the community so that mitigation options can be considered in future land use decisions.	III-14	S A description of development trends in the community is provided on page III-14. <i>Note: A less than "Satisfactory" score on this requirement will not preclude the plan from passing.</i>	

LOCAL HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN REVIEW - POWELL COUNTY, MONTANA
REGION VIII DECEMBER 23, 2004 - PAGE 9

PLAN REVIEW CRITERIA REFERENCE (SECTION PAGE #)	REQUIREMENT AS TAKEN FROM THE INTERIM FINAL RULE PART 201	LOCATION IN THE PLAN (INDICATE SECTION OR ANNEX AND PAGE #)	SCORE / STATE / FEMA REVIEWER COMMENTS SCORING SYSTEM MET/NOT MET (FOR PREREQUISITE (S) ONLY) U--UNSATISFACTORY S--SATISFACTORY N--NEEDS IMPROVEMENT O--OUTSTANDING	
Multi-Jurisdictional Risk Assessment (3-26)	Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(iii): For multi-jurisdictional plans, the risk assessment section must assess each jurisdiction's risks where they vary from the risks facing the entire planning area.	Pages III-8 to III-11	S	The plan does a great job of assessing impacts by hazard and how they vary between the county and Deer Lodge. The plan even identifies separate lists of hazards for the County versus Deer Lodge. In addition, mitigation activities highlight specific jurisdictions within the county. Very clear.
MITIGATION STRATEGY (3-29)	Note: Any changes made in the risk assessment to address previous unsatisfactory or needs improvement scores, will need to be reflected in the Mitigation Strategy section to gain final approval of the plan.			
Local Hazard Mitigation Goals (3-30)	Requirement §201.6(c)(3)(i): [The hazard mitigation strategy shall include: a] description of mitigation goals to reduce or avoid long-term vulnerabilities to the identified hazards.	Page IV-1	S	Six general mitigation goals are listed in priority order in the plan.
Identification and Analysis of Mitigation Measures (3-34)	Requirement §201.6(c)(3)(ii): [The mitigation strategy shall include a] section that identifies and analyzes a comprehensive range of specific mitigation actions and projects being considered to reduce the effects of each hazard, with particular emphasis on new and existing buildings and infrastructure.	Pages IV-2 to IV-5	S	A comprehensive range of mitigation actions are identified for each general goal. The plan does a great job of linking mitigation projects to the goals in a table format. Projects identified improve conditions for both existing and future structures.

LOCAL HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN REVIEW - POWELL COUNTY, MONTANA
REGION VIII DECEMBER 23, 2004 - PAGE 10

PLAN REVIEW CRITERIA REFERENCE (SECTION PAGE #)	REQUIREMENT AS TAKEN FROM THE INTERIM FINAL RULE PART 201	LOCATION IN THE PLAN (INDICATE SECTION OR ANNEX AND PAGE #)	SCORE / STATE / FEMA REVIEWER COMMENTS <u>SCORING SYSTEM</u> MET/NOT MET (FOR PREREQUISITE (S) ONLY) U--UNSATISFACTORY N--NEEDS IMPROVEMENT S--SATISFACTORY O--OUTSTANDING	
Implementation of Mitigation Measures (3-36)	Requirement §201.6(c)(3)(iii): [The mitigation strategy section shall include] an action plan describing how the actions identified in section (c)(3)(ii) will be prioritized, implemented, and administered by the local jurisdiction. Prioritization shall include a special emphasis on the extent to which benefits are maximized according to a cost benefit review of the proposed projects and their associated costs.	Pages IV-1, V-1, IV-6	S	Implementation and administration of mitigation projects are discussed on pages IV-1 and V-1 and will be the overall responsibility of the DES Coordinator. Page IV-6 explains the benefit cost review process for projects considered. We suggest that more timeline details be included in the next revision.
Multi-jurisdictional Mitigation Strategy (3-40)	Requirement §201.6(c)(3)(iv): For multi-jurisdictional plans, there must be identifiable action items specific to the jurisdiction requesting FEMA approval or credit of the plan.	Pages IV-2 to IV-6; V-1	S	Action Items are broken out as either County-wide or specific to Deer Lodge.
PLAN MAINTENANCE PROCEDURES (3-43)				
Monitoring, Evaluating, and Updating the Plan (3-44)	Requirement §201.6(c)(4)(i): [The plan maintenance process shall include a section describing the] method and schedule of monitoring	Page V-2	S	The plan maintenance process is highlighted under the Plan Implementation and Maintenance section of the plan. The plan will be reviewed on a yearly basis. The DES coordinator will be responsible for coordinating and conducting the plan updates that

LOCAL HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN REVIEW - POWELL COUNTY, MONTANA
REGION VIII DECEMBER 23, 2004 - PAGE 11

PLAN REVIEW CRITERIA REFERENCE (SECTION PAGE #)	REQUIREMENT AS TAKEN FROM THE INTERIM FINAL RULE PART 201	LOCATION IN THE PLAN (INDICATE SECTION OR ANNEX AND PAGE #)	SCORE / STATE / FEMA REVIEWER COMMENTS SCORING SYSTEM MET/NOT MET (FOR PREREQUISITE (S) ONLY) U--UNSATISFACTORY S--SATISFACTORY N--NEEDS IMPROVEMENT O--OUTSTANDING
	schedule of monitoring, evaluating, and updating the mitigation plan within a five-year cycle.		will be approved by the Powell County Board of Commissioners with the assistance of the LEPC. Before the end of a five-year period, the updated plan will be submitted to the SHMO and FEMA for acceptance.
Implementation Through Existing Programs (3-48)	Requirement §201.6(c)(4)(ii): [The plan shall include a] process by which local governments incorporate the requirements of the mitigation plan into other planning mechanisms such as comprehensive or capital improvement plans, when appropriate...	Page V-1, III-13	S The county government intends to incorporate the mitigation strategies outlined in this plan into existing planning mechanisms such as the County Comprehensive Growth Policy, and Capital Improvement Plans.
Continued Public Involvement (3-50)	Requirement §201.6(c)(4)(iii): [The plan maintenance process shall include a] discussion on how the community will continue public participation in the plan maintenance process.	Page V-2	S Continued public involvement is discussed on page V-2. A series of Public meetings will be held after each five-year evaluation. The meetings will provide a forum to express ideas, concerns or opinions about the plan. It is unclear if the meetings will be held prior to the five-year plan finalization. Newspapers and radio will be used to notify the public of meetings. We suggest that future submittals state clearly that the public can comment prior to finalizing the five-year plan update.
ADDITIONAL STATE REQUIREMENTS			<i>States that have additional requirements can add them in the appropriate sections of the Plan Review Criteria or create a new section. States need then modify this worksheet to record the score for these requirements</i>

**LOCAL HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN REVIEW – POWELL COUNTY, MONTANA
REGION VIII DECEMBER 23, 2004 – PAGE 12**

PLAN REVIEW CRITERIA REFERENCE (SECTION PAGE #)	REQUIREMENT AS TAKEN FROM THE INTERIM FINAL RULE PART 201	LOCATION IN THE PLAN (INDICATE SECTION OR ANNEX AND PAGE #)	SCORE / STATE / FEMA REVIEWER COMMENTS <u>SCORING SYSTEM</u> MET/NOT MET (FOR PREREQUISITE (S) ONLY) U--UNSATISFACTORY S--SATISFACTORY N--NEEDS IMPROVEMENT O--OUTSTANDING
<i>score for those requirements.</i>			
	Insert State Requirement (s)		